

Interview Summary

Application No. **AND**

09/733,392

92/005710

Applicant(s)

HAASE, RICHARD ALAN

Examiner

Chester T. Barry

Art Unit

1724

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Chester T. Barry.(3) Mr. Haase.(2) Mr. Mark Gilbreth.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: Late March 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: none in particular.Identification of prior art discussed: none.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: After having reviewed the three responses before the interview, the examiner stated that the papers filed 3/1/02 and 3/4/02 were fully responsive, and that all three responses (including the 3/19/02 "second supplemental response") would be entered. The examiner also stated that after having reviewed the substance of the responses, i.e., before any art-based arguments were made during the interview itself, that the examiner had independently decided to apply art not previously of record and to issue a non-final rejection once the search update had been completed.

20020301 20020301